

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested. Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 1-23 stand rejected. In this response, no claims have been canceled and claims 1, 3, 17, 19, and 23 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,052,730 of Felciano et al. (“Felciano”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,587 of Easty et al. (“Easty”). It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-23 include limitations that are not disclosed or suggested by Felciano and Easty, individually, or in combination. Specifically, independent Claim 1 recites as follows:

1. A method comprising:
 - a first client receiving an indication from a controller that at least one new content object corresponding to content specified in a profile associated with the first client is to be downloaded;
 - the first client receiving an indication of a location of the at least one content object from the controller;
 - the first client downloading the content object from the location; and
 - intercepting a request from a second client to a web server on a wide area network (WAN) for the content object and satisfying the request of the second client with the downloaded content object without sending the request to the web server over the WAN, wherein the first and second clients are peer devices of a local network.

(Claim 1, emphasis added)

As set forth above, Claim 1 includes a limitation of intercepting a request from another client of a local network to a web server for the content object and satisfying the request with a downloaded content object without sending a request to the web server over a wide area network (WAN). Applicants respectfully submit that the above limitations absent from the side references, individually or in combination.

In the Office Action, the Examiner sets forth Felciano discloses all of the elements of the claims with the exception of the client receiving and indication of a location of at least one

content object from a controller, which the Examiner believes Easty sets forth. Specifically, with respect to the limitation emphasized above, the Examiner believes that Felciano teaches this at column 4, lines 7-35. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As set forth in column 4, when a document is sent to a client, its URL, which points to a server, is modified so that it points to a CGI script program on a gateway server (of an external network). A subsequent request from the client for the document will automatically be directed to the gateway server. The CGI script in the gateway server is called Lamprey (col. 3, lines 58-29). However, as set forth explicitly at column 4, lines 33-35, using the modified URLs, “Lamprey requests the actual documents directly on behalf of the client.” Thus, it is clear that Felciano sets forth having the CGI script on the gateway server request the actual documents from the same location the original documents were stored on the Internet.

In contrast, Claim 1 sets forth intercepting requests of a second client to a web server for a content object and satisfying the requests with a downloaded content object without sending the request to the web server over a wide area network (e.g., Internet), where the first and second clients are peer devices of a local network. Thus, the present invention as claimed in claim 1 does not request the document from the web server on which it was originally stored, as in Felciano. Thus, in view of this, the present invention as claimed Felciano does not teach intercepting a request of a local client to a web server for a content object and satisfying the request with a downloaded content object without sending a request to the web server over the external network.

Furthermore, the gateway server and the Web browser are not peer devices of a local network. Rather, the gateway server is the gateway of the HTTP server 2 and the Web browser has to communicate with the gateway server over the Internet.

Felciano also does not teach, mention or suggest such a modification to its teachings, nor does Easty make up for this deficiencies. Therefore, a combination of Felciano and Easty does not teach, mention or suggest all the limitations set forth in the claims. In view of this, Applicants respectfully submit the present invention is not obvious in view of Felciano and Easty.

Independent Claims 17, 19 and 23 includes similar limitations. Therefore, for the same reasons, these claims, as well as all dependent claims, are not obvious in view of a combination of Felciano and Easty.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 12/1/01

By: [Signature]

Michael J. Mallie
Reg. No. 36,591

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(408) 720-8300